



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/748,525	12/29/2003	Tae-Woong Koo	21058/0206735-US0	9348

75172 7590 12/30/2008

Client 21058  
c/o DARBY & DARBY P.C.  
P.O. BOX 770  
CHURCH STREET STATION  
NEW YORK, NY 10008-0770

EXAMINER
----------

POHNERT, STEVEN C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1634

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

12/30/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b><i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i></b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/748,525	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KOO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Steven C. Pohnert	<b>Art Unit</b> 1634	

  

**All Participants:**

(1) Steven C. Pohnert.

(2) Martin Sulsky.

**Date of Interview:** 22 December 2008

**Type of Interview:**  
☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant    ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes    ☒ No  
 If Yes, provide a brief description: .

**Status of Application:** pending

(3) \_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_.

**Time:** 2:15

  

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:  
*none*

Claims discussed:  
*none*

Prior art documents discussed:  
*none*

  

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**  
*The examiner contacted applicant's representative about the amendment filed 9/24/2008, as the amendment was not clear as to what had been added or deleted as the underlining and mark throughs were very light if present at all. Applicant's representative confirmed with the issue and agreed to provide a supplemental amendment with the more distinct markings of the changes. No agreements on patentability was reached.*

  

**Part III.**

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  

/Steven C Pohnert/  
 Examiner, Art Unit 1634

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

